

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IMHOTEP JORDAN, Jr.,
aka JOHN JORDAN,
CDCR #C-71742,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DANA M. SABRAW, District Court Judge,

Defendant.

Civil No. 12cv1212 AJB (WVG)

ORDER:

**(1) DISMISSING CIVIL ACTION
FOR FAILING TO PAY FILING
FEES AND FOR FAILING TO
MOVE *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*; AND**

**(2) DISMISSING ACTION AS
FRIVOLOUS PURSUANT TO 28
U.S.C. § 1915A**

Plaintiff, currently incarcerated at Lancaster State Prison located in Lancaster, California, and proceeding pro se, has filed a civil action entitled “Legal Evidentiary Grounds to Vacate this Court’s Prior Orders and Subject Matter Jurisdiction Resulting in the Abrogation of the God Vested Right to Due Process and Equal Protection.” [ECF No. 1].

I. FAILURE TO PAY FILING FEE OR REQUEST IFP STATUS

Any party instituting a civil action, suit or proceeding in a district court of the United States, other than a writ of habeas corpus, must pay a filing fee of \$350. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). An action may proceed despite a party’s failure to pay only if the party is granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). *See Andrews v.*

1 *Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1051 (9th Cir. 2007); *Rodriguez v. Cook*, 169 F.3d 1176, 1177 (9th
2 Cir. 1999). However, Plaintiff has not prepaid the \$350 filing fee required to commence a civil
3 action; nor has he submitted a Motion to Proceed IFP. Therefore, the case must be dismissed
4 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a).

5 **II. Initial Screening per 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)**

6 The Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, obligates the Court to
7 review complaints filed by anyone “incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of,
8 sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms or conditions
9 of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program,” “as soon as practicable after
10 docketing” and regardless of whether the prisoner prepays filing fees or moves to proceed IFP.
11 See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), (c). The Court must sua sponte dismiss prisoner complaints, or any
12 portions thereof, which are frivolous, malicious, or fail to state a claim upon which relief may
13 be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 446-47 (9th Cir. 2000).

14 While Plaintiff’s action is far from clear, Plaintiff is apparently seeking to sue a United
15 States District Judge for unspecified reasons. Plaintiff refers to himself as a “free born free
16 thinking living breathing flesh and blood god created sovereign sentient being” and claims that
17 he has been “falsely imprisoned at Calipatria State Prison at gunpoint.” (Compl. at 1.) A
18 complaint is frivolous “where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v.*
19 *Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Here, the Court finds Plaintiff’s claims to be frivolous
20 under § 1915A because they lack even “an arguable basis either in law or in fact,” and appear
21 “fanciful,” “fantastic,” or “delusional.” *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325, 328. Thus, the Court dismisses
22 the entirety of Plaintiff’s Complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

23 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

24 For the reasons set forth above, the Court hereby:

25 (1) **DISMISSES** this action sua sponte without prejudice for failing to pay the \$350
26 filing fee or file a Motion to Proceed IFP pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a) and 1915(a); and

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:**


2 (2) Plaintiff's Complaint is **DISMISSED** as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3 Moreover, because the Court finds amendment of Plaintiff's claims would be futile at this time,
4 leave to amend is **DENIED**. *See Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 80 F.3d 336, 339 (9th Cir.
5 1996) (denial of a leave to amend is not an abuse of discretion where further amendment would
6 be futile); *see also Robinson v. California Bd. of Prison Terms*, 997 F. Supp. 1303, 1308 (C.D.
7 Cal. 1998) ("Since plaintiff has not, and cannot, state a claim containing an arguable basis in
8 law, this action should be dismissed without leave to amend; any amendment would be futile.")
9 (citing *Newland v. Dalton*, 81 F.3d 904, 907 (9th Cir. 1996)).

10 (3) Further, this Court **CERTIFIES** that any IFP appeal from this Order would not
11 be taken "in good faith" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369
12 U.S. 438, 445 (1962); *Gardner v. Pogue*, 558 F.2d 548, 550 (9th Cir. 1977) (indigent appellant
13 is permitted to proceed IFP on appeal only if appeal would not be frivolous).

14 (4) The Clerk of Court shall close the file.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 DATED: May 21, 2012

18 
19 _____
20 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
21 U.S. District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28